

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 and 9-54 remain pending in the current Application. Claims 1 and 21 have been amended, and claims 7 and 8 have been cancelled. Applicants submit that the amendments do not add new matter to the current Application. All the amendments herein have been made in order to clarify the claims and not for prior art reasons. Applicants also submit that (1) no amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein, and (2) no amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicants have argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

Specification

Applicants have amended paragraph 0001 to updated the related application information, as requested by the Examiner.

Objection of claim 22

Applicants have corrected a typographical error in claim 22 such that it now depends from claim 21 and not itself.

Nonstatutory Double Patenting

Although Applicants disagree that claims 1-3, 6-10, and 21-23 of the current Application are not patentably distinct from claims 1-4, 7, 8, 17-19, 22, and 23 of US7,240,041, in order to further prosecution, Applicants are submitting concurrently herewith a terminal disclaimer.

Rejection of claims 1-7, 9, 10, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-7, 9, 10, and 20 are patentable over US Patent No. 5,473,607 (hereinafter referred to as Hausman). However, in order to further prosecution and not for prior art reasons, Applicants have amended claim 1 to include the elements of claim 8 and intervening claim 7. Note that claim 8 was only rejected under double patenting; however, Applicants are filing concurrently herewith a terminal disclaimer to obviate this rejection. Therefore, claim 8 should be allowable since no other rejections or objections to this claim were provided. Therefore, for at least these reasons, Applicants submit claim 1 is allowable. Claims 2-6 and 9-23 have not been independently addressed since they depend directly or indirectly from allowable claim 1 and are therefore allowable for at least those reasons which apply to claim 1.

Information Disclosure Statement

Concurrently with this Amendment, Applicants are re-submitting an Information Disclosure Statement that was first submitted to the U.S.P.T.O. on August 3, 2005 (prior to the first Office Action on this case). This IDS has not been signed and returned by the Examiner and does not appear in the PAIR system. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner consider the cited references and return a signed copy. Note that the references are being submitted on the new fillable pdf form to conform with current practice. A copy of the original IDS including Applicant's facsimile cover sheet and the confirmation of transmittal are being submitted concurrently herewith as proof that the references were first submitted on August 3, 2005, and received by the U.S.P.T.O.

Conclusion

The Office Action contains numerous statements characterizing the claims, the Specification, and the prior art. Regardless of whether such statements are addressed by Applicants, Applicants refuse to subscribe to any of these statements, unless expressly indicated by Applicants.

Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of the pending claims. Should there be any issues or questions regarding this communication or the current Application, please feel free to contact me.

Although Applicants believe no fees should be due for this amendment or for the IDS being re-submitted, if Applicant has overlooked any additional fees, or if any overpayment has been made, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to credit or debit Deposit Account 503079, Freescale Semiconductor, Inc.

Respectfully submitted,

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Freescale Semiconductor, Inc.
Law Department

Customer Number: 23125

By: /Joanna G. Chiu/
Joanna G. Chiu
Attorney of Record
Reg. No.: 43,629
Telephone: (512) 996-6839
Fax No.: (512) 996-6854